

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 11-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 6 and 7 are allowed. Claims 4 and 11-13 stand rejected. Claims 4 and 11 have been amended. Claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice. Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges Examiner's indication that claims 1, 3, 6 and 7 are allowed and that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, on the grounds that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art, for the reason set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. In response, Applicant cancelled claims 12 and 13 without prejudice. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, on the grounds that the claims are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, for the reason set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. In response, Applicant cancelled claims 12 and 13, and

has amended claim 4 to address all issues raised by Examiner. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cheng (U.S. Patent 4,819,167) for the reasons stated on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Baker (U.S. Patent 4,880,348) for the reasons stated on page 4 of the Office Action. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bonora (U.S. Patent 6,298,280) for the reasons stated on page 4 of the Office Action.

It is respectfully submitted that at the very minimum, amended claim 11 is believed to be patently distinct and patentable over Cheng, Baker and Bonora. For example, neither Cheng, Baker nor Bonora discloses or suggests “*receiving emitted rays, which are reflected by a wafer, by a second array of photo detecting sensors on a third surface of a sensor body orthogonal to the first surface and the second surface of the sensor body for determining wafer damage*”, as essentially claimed in claim 11.

Cheng, Baker and Bonora are directed to a system and a method for determining a *location of a semiconductor wafer* using optical sensors. (See Abstract and Fig. 3 of Cheng; Abstract and Fig. 2 of Baker; Abstract and Fig. 2 of Bonora). It is respectfully submitted that Cheng, Baker and Bonora bear no relation to *determining wafer damage by receiving emitted rays which are*

reflected by a wafer. Accordingly, neither Cheng, Baker nor Bonora anticipates claim 11. Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application, including claims 4 and 11, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully requested. Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if he has any questions or comments in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank V. DeRosa
Reg. No. 43,584
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889